WO

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Michelle Paynton,

Plaintiff,

v.

American Fresh Food LLC, et al.,

Defendants.

No. CV-24-00536-PHX-KML

ORDER

Defendants and their counsel filed a statement explaining their failure to comply with the January 14, 2025, order. (Doc. 45.) Based on that explanation, no further action will be taken. Defendants' statement also "requests that the court . . . reiterate the contents of the court's scheduling order . . . applicable to all counsel." (Doc. 45 at 4.) Defendants believe it is necessary to remind the parties that discovery disputes can be filed only if the disputes "cannot be resolved despite sincere efforts to resolve the matter through personal consultation (in person or by telephone)." (Doc. 35 at 5.) The court reiterates that language applies to all parties. That language, however, does not prevent the parties from conducting some discovery discussions through other means, such as email. Nor does that language give any party a basis to ignore discovery-related communications made through other channels before a dispute arises. ¹

¹ In this case, defense counsel promised supplemental discovery responses the week of December 4, 2024, but failed to produce the responses. (Doc. 38-1 at 7, 9.) Plaintiff's counsel emailed additional discovery-related inquires on December 11, 13, 17, 26, 27, and January 3. (Doc. 38-1 at 9-11.) Defense counsel never responded. The language of the scheduling order does not allow for counsel to ignore attempts to discuss discovery, even if those attempts are made via email.

Accordingly,
2 IT IS ORDE

IT IS ORDERED the court takes no additional action regarding defense counsel's noncompliance with the January 14, 2025, order.

Dated this 7th day of February, 2025.

Honorable Krissa M. Lanham United States District Judge

- 2 -